Inside this issue:

- **"No Kings," May Day, Antifa, Anti-ICE & the Comrade Billionaires Who Fund the Mayhem**
- **U.S. Retrenchment and the "Greater North America" Vision**
- **MAGA No Longer Solid Behind Trump**
- **Expansion of Euthanasia Laws and Organ Donation Practices in Western Countries**
- **Ogles: End 1965 Immigration Act that Flooded America With Third World Migrants**
- **End of Federal Vaccine Incentives**
- **EU Centralizes Power Under Guise of Stopping Illegal Migration**
- **Iran War Silver Lining: NATO's Death Knell?**
- **Landmark Oxford Study Says Myocarditis and Pericarditis Observed Only in Covid-vaccinated Youths**
- **Promising Peptides Under Scrutiny**
- **NYMHM: News You May Have Missed**

"No Kings," May Day, Antifa, Anti-ICE & the Comrade Billionaires Who Fund the Mayhem

On March 28, a Saturday, a coalition of leftist, socialist, and communist groups held their third "No Kings" demonstrations, the earlier two being on June 14 and October 19 of 2025. According to the organizers, the latest event brought out more than eight million marchers to demonstrations in more than 3,000 cities. Those numbers may be exaggerations, but there is no question that many of the events were sizable, with the largest taking place, as expected, in bastions of far-left activism: New York City, Chicago, Minneapolis, Seattle, Los Angeles, Austin, Portland, San Francisco, Philadelphia, Boston, and Washington, D.C. Who organized these rallies? The No Kings mobilize page tells us that "Indivisible is managing registration, data, and communications with participants for this event, and will be sharing data collected via this form with ACLU and our other NO KINGS partner organizations."

Indivisible is a coalition of far-left groups, and No Kings is a united front of leftist coalitions, including MoveOn.org and ProsperUS. These coalitions bring together organizations that include the Democratic Socialists of America (DSA), Communist Party USA (CPUSA), Party of Socialism and Liberation (PSL), Freedom Road Socialist Organization (FRSO), Socialist Alternative (SA), CODEPINK, Black Lives Matter (BLM), The People's Forum, the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), the ANSWER Coalition, the Institute for Policy Studies (IPS), Workers World Party (WWP), Rise and Resist, People's Forum, Revolutionary Communist Party (RCP), ICE Watch, Refuse Fascism, and many more. Many of these groups are openly militant Marxist-Leninist, Maoist, or Trotskyist with records of violence and instigating riots. Freedom Road Socialist Organization (FRSO), for instance, in its "call for the 8th Congress" in 2018 stated: "It is our goal to make this country ungovernable." FRSO Political Secretary Steff Yorek opened that 8th Congress by declaring, "We are revolutionaries…. We are a group of people who are here because we intend to burn down the house and build a new world upon the ashes of the old." She also boasted that "Mao and Stalin were both Marxist-Leninists, uh, that is how, also how I identify, as Marxist-Leninist as well." FRSO also boasts that its

Contributors: Gary Benoit • Steve Bonta • Paul Dragu • Christian Gomez
William F. Jasper • John T. Larabell • Alex Newman • Peter Rykowski • Rebecca Terrell • Joe Wolverton II, J.D.

Copyright ©2026 by *The New American*

members were key instigators of the fiery and deadly George Floyd riots in Minneapolis and dozens of other U.S. cities. They succeeded in turning much of Minneapolis into ashes.

Also, notably partnering with No Kings are left-tilted unions such as American Federation of Teachers (AFT), Service Employees International Union (SEIU), Communications Workers of America (CWA), and American Federation of Government Employees (AFGE). The No Kings rallies have thus far been "generally peaceful," although bands of "direct action" extremists among the demonstrators have initiated clashes with law enforcement in multiple cities by throwing rocks, concrete, and bottles at officers, and by attempting to tear down fences protecting federal buildings. Less than 100 arrests have been reported nationwide.

Things could get much uglier at the next No Kings Day, which is scheduled for May 1. Why May 1, a Friday, rather than May 2, a Saturday, like all of the previous No Kings events? Could it be because May 1 is May Day, a day celebrated by all Marxist-Leninists? This May Day, like all May Days since the Bolshevik Revolution, the Red Flag and Hammer and Sickle will fly in the massive May Day celebration in Moscow's Red Square. Ditto for Beijing, Havana, and Pyongyang. May Day was adopted by Lenin's Bolshevik regime and was spread worldwide by his Comintern (Communist International). While most "progressives" marching in the No Kings events probably have no clue about this May Day connection, the communist and socialist organizations spearheading the operation definitely do understand, and they are heralding it in their newspapers and on their websites. Indivisible co-founder Ezra Levin announced at the March 28 No Kings rally in Saint Paul, Minnesota, that the May 1 action will be a "tactical escalation" demanding "no work, no school, no shopping." "The goal," says the People's World website of the CPUSA, "is to shut down the engines of profit that sustain the current administration's agenda."

This brings us to Antifa. On September 22, 2025, President Trump issued an executive order designating Antifa a terrorist organization. On October 8, 2025, President Trump hosted an Antifa Roundtable at the

White House featuring more than a dozen journalists and influencers who have been reporting on Antifa for years. Some of them have suffered physical injuries from Antifa attacks. The Roundtable participants included Brandi Kruse, Andy Ngo, Katie Daviscourt, Seamus Bruener, Jack Posobic, and Nick Shirley. (A video and transcript of the roundtable can be viewed here.) As a follow-up, the Trump administration announced an international counterterrorism Antifa Summit for June or July. Details about where it will be held and who will be invited have not yet been released.

Many in the media and the Democratic Party leadership still act as though Antifa is a figment of right-wing imagination. Reuters, in a March 31 report on the planned summit, said of Antifa: "Counterterrorism experts argue it does not exist as an organized entity, though people claiming affinity to antifa have been involved in armed attacks in the U.S." Yes, Antifa most certainly exists, as countless videos of their violent attacks and testimonies of their victims prove. In March

of this year, eight Antifa defendants were convicted of attempted murder and terrorism in the July 4, 2025 ambush attack at the Prairieland ICE Detention Center in Alvarado, Texas, in which Alvarado police officer Lieutenant Thomas Gross was shot in the neck.

It is standard operational procedure with terrorist organizations for members to keep their illegal violent activities and their networks secret. They are conspirators who work in secret, in the underground, as Lenin himself, their idol, directed. In one of his best-known works, *What Is to Be Done?*, Lenin confirmed with his words what was obvious from his deeds: "According to its form a strong revolutionary organization may also be described as a conspirative organization ... and we must have the utmost conspiracy for an organization of that kind. Secrecy is such a necessary condition ... that all other conditions (number, and selection of members, functions, etc.) must all be subordinated to it."

In "On the Tactics of the Comintern" Lenin also instructed his fellow conspirators at the Fourth Congress of the Communist International (1922) on the necessity of using "united front" coalitions to bring a wide swath of people into the communist movement. "One of the most important tasks of the Communist parties is to organise resistance against international fascism," Lenin declared. "They must go at the head of the entire working class in struggle against the fascist gangs and energetically utilise, in this arena as well, the tactic of united front, *in which it is indispensable to employ underground methods of organisation*." (Emphasis in original.)

Now you see where the Antifa apparatchiks, who claim to be "antifascist," draw their inspiration. Like Lenin,

they call all who oppose them "fascists." It is a smear tactic that virtually all leftists (communists, socialists, "progressives") have adopted. No Kings is the ultimate "united front," an *omnium-gatherum* of folks who are anti-ICE, anti-police, anti-Iran War, anti-capitalism, anti-Christian, anti-fossil fuel, anti-Trump, pro-Cuba, pro-China, pro-Hamas, pro-open borders, pro-welfare, pro-socialism, pro-LGBTQ "rights," pro-abortion, etc. There is a hobby horse there to attract every grievance lobby. Again, they draw their direction from Lenin, who wrote in 1922, "Without an alliance with non-Communists in the most diverse spheres of activity there can be no question of any successful communist construction." The hardcore Marxist-Leninists comprise only a small fraction of the marching mobs, but they provide the steering hands. As we have pointed out many times over the years, it is clear from the signage at these events who the leading cadres are. The videos and photos of the events prominently demonstrate the dominance of pre-printed signs handed out by FRSO, Indivisible, CPUSA, ANSWER, DSA, CodePink, PSL, RCP, People's Forum, and other staunch leftist and Marxist-Leninist groups. As we have repeatedly noted, the legacy media can be depended on to completely ignore these obvious connections, even when it is pointed out to them and when the evidence is staring them in the face in their own photos and newscast videos. At the same time, the same "journalists" will go to great lengths to find a single individual (probably an agent provocateur) at a MAGA gathering whom they can cite as a Neo-Nazi or "White nationalist" to discredit the conservative event.

The same "mainstream" media will also dependably spike any mention of the established fact that many of the No Kings organizations receive massive Dark Money funding from the likes of Forward US (also styled FWD.us), Arabella Advisors, and Tides Advocacy. Chief funders of FWD.us are billionaires such as Meta/Facebook's Mark and Priscilla Zuckerberg, Microsoft founder Bill Gates, LinkedIn founder Reid Hoffman, Netflix co-CEO Reed Hastings, and former Google executive chairman Eric Schmidt. In other words, they are being funded by the billionaires whom, by their chants, signs, and banners, they claim to be adamantly opposing.

Of particular national security interest is the "philanthropy" of billionaire tech mogul Neville Roy Singham, the husband of CodePink founder Jodie Evans. Singham has been a Marxist-Leninist-Maoist revolutionary since at least 1972, when he joined the Detroit-based League of Revolutionary Black Workers. After selling his IT consulting company in 2017, he moved to China, where he owns or co-owns several companies that do business with China's state-owned enterprises. He has poured millions of dollars into organizations and media groups worldwide that promote the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) line on multiple issues. In the United States, he has been a prominent financial backer of CodePink, People's Forum, Party of Socialism and Liberation, Freedom Road Socialist Organization, ANSWER Coalition, and many other organizations in the socialist-communist orbit. His wife, Jodie Evans, claims that the totalitarian CCP regime is "a defender of the oppressed" and works with the CCP-controlled China Academy to recruit Americans for Chinas tours that glorify Mao's Long March and the CCP. According to her, China is a "wonderland of socialist expression." She has a new book coming out this July entitled *China Is Not Our Enemy*. CodePink, which once upon a time criticized China's atrocious human-rights abuses, now slavishly praises Xi Jinping's prison state.

Singham's involvement with China goes back at least a quarter of a century to 2001, when he began working as a consultant for Huawei, a tech giant in China's CCP-controlled military-industrial complex. Finally, after all of these years, the U.S. government is investigating Singham. Last September the House Oversight Committee and House Ways and Means Committee subpoenaed records of the Singham-funded People's Forum, a tax exempt NGO, and requested that the Treasury Department investigate freezing his assets or imposing sanctions due to his CCP ties and failure to register under the Foreign Agents Registration Act. On January 7 of this year, the House Oversight Committee voted, on a motion by Representative Anna Paulina Luna (R-Fla.), to subpoena Singham for the subversive activities and groups he has been funding. — William F. Jasper

This article will appear in the Law Enforcement Charitable Foundation Spring 2026 Intelligence Brief.

U.S. Retrenchment and the "Greater North America" Vision

Fox News recently reported on a March 6 speech in which Defense Secretary Pete Hegseth outlined Washington's emerging "Greater North America" concept — a strategic framework for U.S. dominance spanning from Greenland to the Panama Canal. Critics couldn't help but draw comparisons to what the Technocracy movement back in the 1930s called "The Technate" — a continental-sized "cooperation-zone" designed to be integrated into a one-world government. While the striking resemblance of the two political visions has startled many observers, the underlying policy shift reflects a broader geopolitical recalibration. As America's global supremacy erodes, strategists argue the United States is contracting inward to secure the Western Hemisphere's resources and supply chains.

This vision coincides with concrete Trump administration actions. On January 3, U.S. forces conducted a military raid in Caracas, capturing Venezuelan President Nicolás Maduro and his wife, Cilia Flores. President Trump announced the operation on Truth Social, declaring the United States would temporarily "run" Venezuela, control its oil industry, and prosecute Maduro on drug-trafficking charges. The move was justified as law enforcement backed by military power, though widely condemned internationally as a violation of individual national sovereignty.

Simultaneously, Trump adopted a belligerent tone regarding Greenland, floating military options, tariffs on

European allies, and partnerships to secure rare-earth minerals vital for defense and technology — resources Beijing currently dominates. Regarding Canada, the Trump administration has eyed oil-rich Alberta's separatist movement, with reports of U.S. engagement with provincial leaders frustrated by Ottawa's policies. Trump's December 2025 National Security Strategy explicitly resurrected the Monroe Doctrine as the "Trump Corollary" (or "Donroe Doctrine"), pledging to "reassert and enforce" U.S. preeminence in the hemisphere, exclude "non-Hemispheric competitors" such as China, and protect key geographies, migration routes, and resources.

These steps align with analyses from geopolitical thinkers who foresee America's post-hegemony future. In a March 21 interview with Tucker Carlson, a public intellectual named Jiang Xueqin argued that the United States, facing unsustainable global commitments, has "almost no choice" but to contract to the Western Hemisphere. Resource scarcity will drive "control of and even 'reintegration' with Canada and Mexico," he predicted: Mexico for labor, Canada for vast natural wealth, and extensions into Greenland, Cuba, and Venezuela to secure supply chains. "The United States economy is essentially a Ponzi scheme," Jiang noted, warning that withdrawal from distant theaters such as the Middle East would force hemispheric consolidation to sustain American power.

Other analysts echo this retrenchment thesis. Geopolitical forecaster George Friedman has described a two-part U.S. strategy: disengaging from the Eastern Hemisphere while dominating the West to reduce vulnerability and bolster economic self-sufficiency. The result is a de facto hemispheric bloc — not formal annexation, but deepened integration through trade (USMCA), security pacts, resource access, and selective military pressure.

Critics warn of a destabilized Latin America and alienated neighbors, yet proponents view Hegseth's plan as pragmatic realism in a newly emerging "multipolar world." Whether the incentive involves strategic necessity or imperial overreach, the "Greater North America" idea marks a decisive pivot: America could be fortifying its own backyard rather than policing the globe. — Rebecca Terrell

MAGA No Longer Solid Behind Trump

"How many of you would like to see impeachment hearings?" The American Conservative Union's Matt Schlapp posed that question on March 27 at the recent Conservative Political Action Conference (CPAC) he chaired in Grapevine, Texas. As a pro-Trumper addressing a MAGA-dominated event, Schlapp undoubtedly expected the crowd to shout "No!" But his attempt to fire everyone up did not go as planned. The crowd cheered. Shaking his head, Schlapp said, "No, that was the wrong answer. We'll try it again." The second go-around, Schlapp still got some applause, albeit not as much as before, while he himself shouted the expected response, "Nooo!" He then quipped, "Can someone bring some coffee out for the people at CPAC?" (Watch video here.)

But though Schapp would like to attribute the unexpected response to CPAC attendees not being awake, perhaps more were awake than he'd like to think.

To be sure, there is no discernible movement within MAGA calling for Trump's impeachment. But there is growing dissatisfaction with Trump among his base because of the gap between his past "America First" pronouncements and his positions today, particularly regarding the war in Iran. One CPAC attendee, 30-year-old military veteran Joseph Bolick, told NPR, "I feel betrayed because he's promised no new wars." According to NPR, Bolick "has voted for Trump since

The New American
TOP DAILY HEADLINES
YOUR RED-PILLED INTELLIGENCE SOURCE!
STRAIGHT FROM OUR PAGES TO YOUR INBOX
Follow us on Social Media

2016 and now says he no longer supports him." Another liberal organ that interviewed Bolick was Politico, which said that "Bolick is part of a cohort of young MAGA loyalists who are increasingly frustrated with Trump over the war in Iran."

Though many have forgotten, Trump won much support in the past by taking a strong position against "endless wars" and policing the world. For example, on June 13, 2020, during his first term as president, he told the graduating class at West Point, "We are ending the era of endless wars. In its place is a renewed, clear-eyed focus on defending America's vital interests. It is not the duty of U.S. troops to solve ancient conflicts in faraway lands that many people have never even heard of. We are not the policemen of the world." And in his victory speech in November of 2024, he said "I'm not going to start a war, I am going to stop wars."

Many MAGA supporters are also upset with Trump over other issues, such as his months-long opposition to releasing the Epstein Files, before signing the legislation to release the files after Republican Congressman Thomas Massie's successful discharge-petition effort. And speaking of Massie, Trump is so upset with him that he is trying to get the constitutionalist-minded congressman defeated in the Republican primary in Kentucky on May 19. The results of that election will tell us a lot about the extent to which the MAGA base is upset with Trump.

The liberal media views weakening support for Trump within MAGA as an indicator that the *movement* is in decline and may be dying. This wishful thinking on the part of the media is based on the assumption that Trump created MAGA, and that Trump and MAGA are essentially the same. But that is not the case. As this writer observed in 2021 regarding "Trumpworld" (aka MAGA): "The principal personality in Trumpworld is, of course, Donald Trump. But Trumpworld and Trump, though now very intertwined, are not the same. Trumpworld existed long before Trump threw his hat into the political ring, though under different names, such as the Tea Party or (earlier) the Silent Majority…. In a very real sense, Trumpworld created the Trump phenomenon, not the other way around."

Of course, in the future the movement may be called something other than MAGA. But the fact that some in the movement may be getting upset with Trump because of his drift from the movement's "America First" principles does not mean that the movement is in decline. Far from it! It means that many in the movement are sufficiently awake to understand that when a president or political party takes a position contrary to "America First," they must support the principle of "America First" — not the president, and not the political party.

Over many decades, The John Birch Society and its publishing organs, including *The New American*, have contributed mightily to creating the understanding that is so vitally needed to save and restore our endangered freedoms. Without that understanding, there would have been no MAGA. And because of it, we still have the opportunity to use our freedoms to save our freedoms.

The key, of course, is to stay focused on creating the understanding. As the understanding grows, the freedom movement will grow along with it, and politicians will learn that they must abide by their oath of office to the Constitution in order to stay electable. — Gary Benoit

Expansion of Euthanasia Laws and Organ-donation Practices in Western Countries

Canada's Medical Assistance in Dying (MAiD) program, legalized federally in 2016, has become one of the most expansive euthanasia frameworks in the world. Initially limited to terminal illness, it expanded in 2021 to include non-terminal conditions causing "grievous and irremediable" suffering. MAiD now accounts for roughly four to five percent of all deaths in Canada, with more than 15,000 cases in 2023 alone.

A distinctive feature of Canada's system is the integration of organ donation after MAiD (often called OD-MAiD). Since the first such donations in 2016, Canada has led globally: A 2022 study of four countries (Belgium, Canada, Netherlands, and Spain) found nearly half of all euthanasia-related organ donations came from Canada (136 of 286 donors). These procedures yielded 74 organs from 30 donors in early data from three provinces. Protocols separate the MAiD procedure from donation to preserve consent and ethics, yet critics

highlight potential conflicts of interest. Transplant charges can reach millions per recipient (per U.S. Milliman reports cited in debates), and some ethicists warn that organ donations could create perverse incentives.

Euthanasia laws in Belgium and the Netherlands predate those of Canada by more than a decade, but the latter's model has influenced discussions elsewhere. Spain legalized euthanasia in 2021. By 2022 it reported higher OD-MAiD rates relative to total cases than some peers. Organ donation after MAiD is now permitted in these four jurisdictions under strict rules emphasizing patient consent.

Recent high-profile cases illustrate the application of these laws to mental suffering and trauma:

• In the Netherlands, 17-year-old Milou Verhoof was euthanized in 2023 after years of depression, anxiety, and sexual abuse (including in a mental health facility). Her parents supported the decision; psychiatrists faced professional rebuke for public criticism.

• In Belgium, 23-year-old Shanti De Corte, a survivor of the 2016 Brussels airport terrorist attack, received euthanasia in 2022 for PTSD and depression deemed "unbearable and incurable."

• In Spain, 25-year-old Noelia Castillo Ramos was euthanized on March 26 of this year. Paraplegic after a 2022 migrant gang rape in a state care facility and a subsequent suicide attempt, she was offered the option of euthanizing herself. She eventually pursued legal approval through Spain's courts and the European Court of Human Rights. Reports are now reaching the public, however, that, before her termination, she was having second thoughts, but was told that she could not back out due to the millions of dollars her organs would bring. The criminals who violated her were not executed; she was.

While proponents emphasize autonomy and relief from suffering, opponents argue that expanding MAiD to psychiatric cases risks pressuring the vulnerable, and that linking it to organ donation creates financial incentives. Canadian and international data show OD-MAiD remains a small fraction of total MAiD cases (under 0.5 percent in most years), and donation is voluntary. However, reports note rising numbers and call for stricter oversight to prevent any perception of a "supply chain" for organs.

Unfortunately, the trend is clear, and more Western nations are debating whether to adopt similar laws. After abortion was normalized in the 1970s, and euthanasia was normalized for the elderly during the Covid period, the pincers movement has drawn down on other age-range cohorts as the value of life has been systematically downgraded. — Rebecca Terrell

Ogles: End 1965 Immigration Act that Flooded America With Third World Migrants

The United States must overturn the 1965 Hart-Celler Immigration Act that opened up the nation to never-ending streams of Third World migration, argued Representative Andy Ogles (R-Tenn.) in this interview with *The New American* magazine's Alex Newman. His bill, H.R. 7964, would do just that.

According to Ogles, the controversial 1965 legislation, which key sponsors in Congress promised would not upset the demographic balance of America, was a "declaration of war" against the nation. It has undermined American culture, religious values, and economic vitality, he said.

The key goal of Democrats is more voters. With everyday Americans fleeing Democrat jurisdictions such as California, Illinois, New York, and New Jersey for conservative states such as Florida, Tennessee, and

Texas, Democrats need migrants to replenish their ranks.

However, it is not too late to turn the tide. Among other needs, Ogles called for mass deportations, reforming or abolishing various immigration schemes such as H-1B visas, and more. With Trump in office and Congress under Republican control, now is the chance to get it done.

Listen to this important interview by Alex Newman at TheNewAmerican.com.

End of Federal Vaccine Incentives

Doctors will no longer receive financial rewards tied to childhood vaccination rates under key government programs. The announcement, first detailed in a December 30 memo from the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS), states that the agency "does not tie payment to performance on immunization quality measures in Medicaid and CHIP [Children's Health Insurance Program] at the federal level." CMS urged states to discontinue similar incentives and eliminated mandatory reporting of childhood immunization data, though voluntary reporting remains an option. The memo also signaled efforts to strengthen informed consent and accommodate religious exemptions.

U.S. Health and Human Services Secretary Robert F. Kennedy, Jr. welcomed the directive, posting: "Government bureaucracies should never coerce doctors or families into accepting vaccines or penalize physicians for respecting patient choice. That practice ends now." Advocates such as Children's Health Defense CEO Mary Holland called it a welcome step toward treating vaccines like other medical interventions, free from metric-driven pressure. Pediatrician Dr. Michelle Perro noted that tying compensation to specific decisions can erode trust in care.

This change comes after years of scrutiny over financial incentives in pediatric medicine. An October 2025 clip from Dr. Suzanne Humphries on *The Joe Rogan Experience* claimed some doctors could lose up to $250,000 annually by not meeting vaccination targets, including for Covid shots in infants. These incentives stemmed from value-based payment models under Medicaid, CHIP, and private insurers. Practices received bonuses or higher reimbursements for hitting coverage benchmarks (e.g., percentages of patients vaccinated). One analysis of an Oregon pediatric practice projected more than $1 million in annual losses for declining CDC-scheduled vaccines, largely from administrative fees. Roughly 40 percent of U.S. children are on Medicaid, amplifying the program's reach. During Covid, specific per-dose payments (around $45 plus administration fees) added to the structure.

Proponents of the incentives argued they promoted preventive care and reduced disease outbreaks, with insurers — not pharmaceutical companies — providing payments to lower long-term costs. Critics, however, contended the metrics distorted clinical judgment and pressured families, contributing to eroded trust and reports of patients being dismissed for declining shots.

The CMS policy applies only at the federal level; some states or private insurers may retain incentives. It is telling that pediatric organizations are pushing back against broader vaccine-policy shifts under the current administration. — Rebecca Terrell

EU Centralizes Power Under Guise of Stopping Illegal Migration

The European Union is once again centralizing its power at the expense of its member states' sovereignty, this time under the guise of strengthening its immigration policies and deterring illegal migration.

The Associated Press reports:

> The European Union is expanding its powers to track, raid and deport migrants to "return hubs" in third countries in Africa and elsewhere, quietly adopting tactics of the Trump administration that have drawn public criticism across the 27-nation bloc.
>
> The EU continues to tighten migration policies after right-wing parties took power in some countries in 2024. European Commission President Ursula von der Leyen, from the center-right European People's Party coalition, has said that the new measures will prevent a repeat of the 2015 crisis caused by Syria's

> civil war, when about 1 million people arrived to seek asylum.
>
> "We have learnt the lessons of the past. And today, we are better equipped," von der Leyen has said. The new policies, known as the Pact on Migration and Asylum, go into effect on June 12….
>
> The EU's new migration regulations allow for more police raids in private homes and public spaces and more use of surveillance and racial profiling, said a letter to EU institutions in February from 88 nonprofit groups including the Brussels-based Platform for International Cooperation on Undocumented Migrants.

Although the EU's new migration policies may appear positive — after all, European countries should crack down on mass migration — we must remember that immigration and deportation policy should be the exclusive purview of the EU's member states. By telling its member states what immigration policies they may and may not implement, the EU is infringing on a core element of national sovereignty.

Under the EU's "freedom of movement" principle and open-borders Schengen Area, member states have already surrendered a significant amount of sovereignty over border and immigration policy to the EU — and the EU appears to be further strengthening its power.

Additionally, there has been speculation about potentially giving the European Border and Coast Guard Agency (known as Frontex) greater domestic authority. The Associated Press reports:

> In 2024, Belgium passed a law allowing the EU border service Frontex operations inside the country, stoking fears among activists that Frontex could join in on raids.
>
> But Frontex's mandate just covers borders, said spokesperson Chris Borowski, and the current role in voluntary or involuntary returns for the service includes "coordinating flights, helping with travel documents and making sure fundamental rights are respected throughout the process."

The European migrant crisis, which began in 2015, is an excellent example of using a manufactured crisis to expand government power. As *The New American* reported in October 2015, globalist Insiders created the migrant crisis in the first place, including by creating conflicts in multiple Middle Eastern and North African countries. Furthermore, no sooner did the crisis begin than EU officials began promoting more EU power as the solution to the crisis. Unfortunately, it appears that Europeans — including those who lean conservative — have largely bought into this narrative.

We must prevent any similar centralization of power from occurring in the United States — and roll back the federal government's existing build-up of power — no matter the crisis used to justify it. — Peter Rykowski

Iran War Silver Lining: NATO's Death Knell?

In a rare silver-lining moment, the war against Iran is causing U.S. leaders to rethink America's relationship with NATO.

If a recent message from President Donald Trump to European leaders is to be taken seriously, the collective defense pact central to NATO membership is already nullified. Trump said Tuesday morning in a Truth Social message to European leaders, "You'll have to start learning how to fight for yourself, the U.S.A. won't be there to help you anymore, just like you weren't there for us." The president's preceding sentences indicate his frustration was triggered by Europe's refusal to help secure the Strait of Hormuz, which Iran has effectively shut down:

THE ONYX COLLECTION
Showers & Lavatories
Custom Made in Kansas, USA Since 1985
800-669-9867 • www.onyxcollection.com
MADE IN THE USA

> All of those countries that can't get jet fuel because of the Strait of Hormuz, like the United Kingdom, which refused to get involved in the decapitation of Iran, I have a suggestion for you: Number 1, buy from the U.S., we have plenty, and Number 2, build up some delayed courage, go to the Strait, and just TAKE IT.

This isn't the first time Trump has gotten angry with Europe for refusing to help fight the war in Iran.

U.S. officials are also upset at NATO member nations that denied American military access to their bases during the war. Those nations include Spain, Italy, the U.K. (which initially blocked American access before opening up for "defensive" or "collective self-defense" missions), and France, which restricts access to its bases except for U.S. aircraft that aren't involved in the war.

Trump called out France on Tuesday. "The Country of France wouldn't let planes headed to Israel, loaded up with military supplies, fly over French territory," he said on Truth Social. "France has been VERY UNHELPFUL with respect to the 'Butcher of Iran,' who has been successfully eliminated! The U.S.A. will REMEMBER!!!"

In Germany, where more American soldiers are stationed than in any other European nation, the ascending Alternative for Germany (AfD) party called for the United States to pull out all its troops. "AfD co-leader, Tino Chrupalla, told a party gathering in east Germany on Saturday that the country should chase an 'independent' foreign policy, starting with the removal of American soldiers," according to reports.

Secretary of Defense Pete Hegseth also made comments on Tuesday indicating growing American disillusionment with NATO. "You don't have much of an alliance if you have countries that are not willing to stand with you when you need them," he said. "A lot has been laid bare.… When we ask for additional assistance … we get questions, or roadblocks, or hesitation."

Secretary of State Marco Rubio, who's been a NATO cheerleader his entire political career, issued more measured yet equally critical comments. "If NATO is just about us defending Europe if they're attacked but then denying us basing rights when we need them, that's not a very good arrangement," Rubio said. "That's a hard one to stay engaged in and say this is good for the United States. So all that's going to have to be reexamined. All of it's going to have to be reexamined."

A reporter suggested to Rubio that that the general view in Europe is that the United States was already in the process of abandoning the alliance. The reporter said:

> I recently … spent some time in Europe, and basically what they say is that it's the U.S. which is sending confusing messages to us, it's the U.S. which is planning to disengage from Europe, it's the U.S. which doesn't seem to be really willing to team up with NATO when it comes to moving forward in Europe, and this explains the reason why we are being very cautious dealing with the Americans when it comes to the Strait of Hormuz in particular.

Rubio didn't buy it:

> Well, if that's what someone in Europe told you, that person is very disingenuous because the United States has tens of thousands of troops stationed throughout that region, billions of dollars of weaponry staged throughout Europe — all of it there to defend Europe. Not to defend America. To defend Europe from attack. All over it. The United States is — without the United States, there is no NATO. I mean, everyone recognizes that, including NATO. If we decided tomorrow that we were going to remove our troops from Europe, that would be the end of NATO. So they know that. And that commitment — we haven't moved troops out of NATO. So anyone who said that is not being honest, is not — I think they're playing games.

Rubio finished by echoing Hegseth's sentiments. "At the end of the day it's very simple," he said. "NATO is an alliance, and an alliance means it has to be mutually beneficial. It cannot be a one-way street. Let's hope we can fix it. We'll have time to address it after. Right now we're focused on this operation."

To the Europeans, it may indeed look as though the Trump administration already abandoned the alliance. As soon as he got back into office, Trump began applying immense pressure on Europe to boost defense spending. And it has worked. Several nations, including Germany, Poland, and a collection of Scandinavian countries, have significantly increased defense spending and training. And they've become better equipped to protect themselves as a result.

Read the remainder of this article by Paul Dragu, including "What's in It for the U.S.?", at TheNewAmerican.com.

Landmark Oxford Study Says Myocarditis and Pericarditis Observed Only in Covid-vaccinated Youths

A major observational study from the University of Oxford confirms fears about Covid-19 vaccine safety in children. Published as a preprint in May 2024 on medRxiv, the OpenSAFELY analysis examined health records of approximately 1.7 million children and adolescents in England. Researchers tracked outcomes following Pfizer-BioNTech vaccination and found that all documented cases of myocarditis and pericarditis occurred exclusively among those who received the shots. No such cases were recorded in the unvaccinated comparison group during the study's observation windows.

The study, conducted via the OpenSAFELY secure analytics platform, focused on vaccine effectiveness and safety signals. It reported roughly 27 cases of myocarditis or pericarditis per million children after the first dose and about 10 cases per million after the second dose. Senior author William Hulme emphasized that the 1.7 million figure refers to the total study population, not the number affected. Actual cardiac events numbered in the dozens across the vaccinated cohort.

The pharmaceutical industry and its advocates have pushed back on interpretations circulating in alternative media. They note the preprint has not yet undergone full peer review and was designed primarily to assess vaccination outcomes rather than comprehensively compare vaccine-related versus infection-related myocarditis. The study did not include a parallel analysis of heart inflammation following SARS-CoV-2 infection in the same population, nor did it track unvaccinated children for infection-triggered cases in identical time frames. High-risk children were also excluded from some cohorts.

Nevertheless, the findings align with earlier data showing a temporal association between mRNA vaccines (especially second doses) and myocarditis/pericarditis, predominantly in adolescent males. Global surveillance systems, including the CDC's Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System (VAERS), have consistently identified this pattern since 2021, with highest risks in teenage boys after dose two. Most cases resolve with rest and anti-inflammatory treatment, but concerns persist about long-term cardiac effects in a demographic with near-zero risk of severe Covid-19.

The Oxford results arrive as public-health authorities are reevaluating pediatric Covid mandates. First acknowledged in 2021, the danger signal led the CDC to announce in May of last year that it would no longer recommend Covid-19 shots for healthy children and pregnant women. The OpenSAFELY data — drawn from real-world English health records — provides one

of the largest snapshots yet of vaccinated versus unvaccinated youth in a controlled observational setting. It raises pointed questions: If no cases appeared in the unvaccinated under the study parameters, why were healthy children pressured into a product carrying even a small cardiac risk?

While the pharmaceutical industry insists that absolute risk remains relatively low, the exclusive appearance of these inflammatory events in the vaccinated group in this large dataset fuels legitimate skepticism about universal recommendations for low-risk age groups. Why were healthy children administered experimental mRNA shots under emergency authorization? The study shows the importance of proper risk-benefit analysis rather than blind trust in such situations.

As explained in the landmark *Principles of Biomedical Ethics*, one of the pillars of morality in the medical industry is autonomy, i.e., the ability to make one's own decisions (a.k.a. informed consent). If the contraindications of a therapy are not properly articulated, then informed consent cannot be achieved. Hence the coercion of a procedure cannot, definitionally, be ethical. — Rebecca Terrell

Promising Peptides Under Scrutiny

In recent years, interest has surged in BPC 157, a synthetic protein modeled on a natural protein fragment found in human gastric juice. Stable even in stomach acid and easily absorbed, it has been studied mostly in animals for its potential to speed tissue repair. Researchers describe it as a "cytoprotective" agent (able to protect cells from injury) that can improve blood flow, lower blood pressure, support brain and muscle function, control tissue damage and immune overactivity, promote new blood-vessel growth, reduce inflammation, and fight free radicals, among other positive effects.

BPC stands for Body Protection Compound, and hundreds of Americans once enjoyed its benefits at medical clinics and spas across the country. A plethora of animal studies had painted an impressive picture. BPC 157 has accelerated healing of cut tendons, ligaments, muscles, and bones, even when healing is impaired by corticosteroids or poor blood supply. It helped close fistulas, repaired spinal-cord compression injuries,

reduced brain damage after stroke-like events, and improved memory and movement in behavioral tests. In models of heart failure, arrhythmias, pulmonary hypertension, and multi-organ injury from toxins or blockages, it counteracted damage, normalized blood pressure swings, and prevented thrombosis without disrupting normal clotting. It also protected the gut lining in ulcer and colitis models, and showed protective effects against insulin overdose and toxicity from non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs). Equally promising is preclinical toxicology, which found no lethal dose and no major organ toxicity.

A few human pilot studies (knee injections, bladder instillations, short IV infusions) have reported pain relief or symptom improvement with no obvious side effects, and earlier ulcerative-colitis trials noted a clean safety record.

Yet in 2023, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) placed BPC 157 and 18 other popularly-prescribed peptides in a restricted category for medical use, effectively barring pharmacies from compounding them. Critics voice many concerns: Most studies involve only lab animals, while there is insufficient long-term safety information from controlled trials involving humans; impurities could taint unregulated versions sold online; in theory, there could be risks involving immune reactions or even cancer (the buzzword used to kill prospects for promising products).

It's important to note that none of these theoretical problems have actually been recorded in humans. Social-media enthusiasts insist their experience with products from online vendors has been positive, but mainstream media is full of expert warnings against self-experimentation.

However, peptide proponents have long argued that the FDA lacked any "safety signal" to justify restricting such products. In February, U.S. Health and Human Services Secretary Robert F. Kennedy, Jr. acknowledged that reality, announcing that BCP 157, along with more than a dozen other therapeutic peptides, would be reclassified, allowing pharmacies to provide them to patients with valid prescriptions.

Kennedy's announcement does not mean that these peptides have full FDA drug approval, which requires rigorous long-term clinical trials (unless you're an mRNA vaccine). It only means the peptides are added to the agency's bulk drug substances and are therefore "eligible for compounding." In other words, if there is no medication available for a patient's specific needs (due to an allergy to an inactive ingredient, need for a different dose or form such as tablet instead of liquid, or during shortages), then a substance eligible for compounding can be used as a starter material to create customized medications. Otherwise, peptides such as BCP 157 remain unavailable, except in unregulated, unauthorized products from online vendors.

The agency's cautious regulatory stance stands in stark contrast to its behavior during the Covid-19 era, when mRNA vaccines moved from lab to widespread use under emergency authorization after accelerated clinical trials. BPC 157, backed by decades of preclinical work, still awaits deserved attention. The situation has raised speculation, grouping these peptides in the same red-headed stepchild category as ivermectin and hydroxychloroquine (in relation to Covid). Like their cousins, these simple, unpatentable peptides offer little financial motivation for large-scale pharmaceutical investment, while patented drugs or novel therapies do. Regardless, the fact remains: Promising animal data have not translated into swift clinical progress. — Rebecca Terrell

NYMHM: News You May Have Missed

MAGA Must Stand Firm on Deportations & Guns, Trump-backed Candidate for Congress Says

AMA: We Didn't Mean It When We Said Kids Shouldn't Get Gender Surgery

Former CentCom Chief McKenzie: U.S. Has Planned for Kharg Island Attack for Years

Bulls Axe Jaden Ivey for Citing Christian Teaching on Homosexuality

Trump Says Iran Wants a Ceasefire, Iran Denies It

Report: Hegseth Attempted Big Defense Industry Investment Before War; Graham Spotted at Disney World

Trump Shifts Goal to End Iran War Yesterday: Iran Must Not Have Nukes. Today: Open the Strait of Hormuz.

Robinson Defense: Bullet That Killed Kirk Does Not Match Rifle

State Department Sends $1.25 Billion to Trump's "Board of Peace"

Canada Poised to Declare Quoting the Bible a Hate Crime

Epstein Exposed: Victim's Stories Reveal Satanic, Unfathomable Crimes

JD Vance Emerges as Key Player in Negotiations With Iran: Reports

Colorado Moves Against Fur Sales, Reviving the War on Hunting and Trapping

Rothschild Bank Raided in French Epstein Investigation

Study: More Americans Than Not Still Believe Overpopulation Myth

NYT: Iran's Strikes Have Wrecked 13 U.S. Bases in Middle East. Trump Extends Deadline to Reopen Strait of Hormuz

[END]